

Facility: <u>BV-1</u>		Date of Examination: <u>8/6-10/01</u>
Examinations Developed by: <u>Facility</u> / NRC (circle one)		
Target Date*	Task Description / Reference	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a & b)	TF
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	TF
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c)	TF
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	TF
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)]	N/A
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d)	TF
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)	TF
-45	8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d)	TF
-30	9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	TF
-14	10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	TF
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	TF
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	TF
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	TF
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204)	TF
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k)	TF
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	TF

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1		Date of Examination: 8/6/01		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.	TW	TEX	TF
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.	TW	TEX	TF
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	TW	TEX	TF
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	TW	TEX	TF
2. S I M	a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, and major transients.	TW	TEX	TF
	b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity; ensure each applicant can be tested using at least one new or significantly modified scenario, that no scenarios are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s)*, and scenarios will not be repeated over successive days.	TW	TEX	TF
	c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D.	TW	TEX	TF
3. W / T	a. Verify that: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks, (2) no more than 30% of the test material is repeated from the last NRC examination, (3)* no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s), and (4) no more than 80% of any operating test is taken directly from the licensee's exam banks.	TW	TEX	TF
	b. Verify that: (1) the tasks are distributed among the safety function groupings as specified in ES-301, (2) one task is conducted in a low-power or shutdown condition, (3) 40% of the tasks require the applicant to implement an alternate path procedure, (4) one in-plant task tests the applicant's response to an emergency or abnormal condition, and (5) the in-plant walk-through requires the applicant to enter the RCA.	TW	TEX	TF
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	TW	TEX	TF
	d. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on successive days.	TW	TEX	TF
4. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	TW	TEX	TF
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	TW	TEX	TF
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	TW	TEX	TF
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	TW	TEX	TF
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	TW	TEX	TF
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	TW	TEX	TF
a. Author		T. Wooley / <i>T. Wooley</i>		Date
b. Facility Reviewer (*)		T. Kuber / <i>T. Kuber</i>		6/26/01
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)		Todd Fish / <i>Todd Fish</i>		6/29/01
d. NRC Supervisor		R.J. Coate / <i>R.J. Coate</i>		7/9/01
Note:		* Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Discussed acceptable 2/9/01		
		# Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c," chief examiner concurrence required.		

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 4/16/01 ^(8/6/01) as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC. Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 8/6/01. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE	SIGNATURE (2)	DATE NOTE
1. Rufus R. Murphy	TRAINING SYSTEMS SUP.	<i>Rufus R. Murphy</i>	3/2/01	<i>Rufus R. Murphy</i>	8/13/01
2. Robert W. Huston	Rx Engr	<i>Robert W. Huston</i>	3/2/01	<i>Robert W. Huston</i>	8/20/01
3. Thomas E. Kuhler	Nuclear Training Supervisor	<i>Tom E. Kuhler</i>	3/23/01	<i>Tom E. Kuhler</i>	8/20/01
4. PATRICK J. SCHWARTZ	Superintendent, operations training	<i>Patrick J. Schwartz</i>	4/2/01	<i>Patrick J. Schwartz</i>	8/17/01
5. EDWARD J. MACKAY JR.	RWE	<i>Edward J. Mackay Jr.</i>	5/25/01	<i>Edward J. Mackay Jr.</i>	8/17/01
6. Paul E. Brouner	Assoc. Nuc. Techn.	<i>Paul E. Brouner</i>	6/7/01	<i>Paul E. Brouner</i>	8/13/01
7. Chris Hynes	OPS TRAINING SUPT	<i>Chris Hynes</i>	6/14/01	<i>Chris Hynes</i>	8/17/01
8. PAUL J. BAUM	SR. NUC. OPS. INST. (CONFIG. CONTR.)	<i>Paul J. Baum</i>	6-28-01	<i>Paul J. Baum</i>	8-13-01
9. ALBERT HARKNER	UNIT 1 OPS. SUPT.	<i>Albert Harkner</i>	7-26-01	<i>Albert Harkner</i>	8-23-01
10. Beverly Bolombi	Nuclear Inter. Clerk	<i>Beverly Bolombi</i>	7-27-01	<i>Beverly Bolombi</i>	8-13-01
11. GEORGE CHRISTOPHE	ANSS	<i>George Christophe</i>	073001	<i>George Christophe</i>	081301
12. Greg Pelka	SNOI	<i>Greg Pelka</i>	8/2/01	<i>Greg Pelka</i>	8/13/01
13. THOMAS A. GAYDOSIK	Sup. Nuclear Advisor	<i>Thomas A. Gaydosik</i>	8/13/01	<i>Thomas A. Gaydosik</i>	8/17/01
14. JAMES H. KENES	STA	<i>James H. Kenes</i>	8/6/01	<i>James H. Kenes</i>	8/20/01
15. LEONARD KABANA	LNI	<i>Leonard Kabana</i>	8-6-01	<i>Leonard Kabana</i>	8-13-01

NOTES:

p. 2 of 2

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 4/16/01 ^(8/6/01) as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC. Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 8/6/01. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE	SIGNATURE	DATE NOTE
1. T. J. KENNY	EXAM AUTHOR	<i>T. J. Kenny</i>	12/18/00	Signed per teleconf	8/17/01
2. LARRY E. BRIGGS	EXAM AUTHOR SUPPORT	<i>Larry E. Briggs</i>	1/22/01	Signed per teleconf	8/17/01
3. Roy Brooks	SUPERVISOR	<i>Roy Brooks</i>	1/31/01	Signed per teleconf	8/17/01
4. Tom Woolley	Sr. Instructor	<i>Tom Woolley</i>	2/1/01	<i>Tom Woolley</i>	8/17/01
5. RC ERNFIELD	SIM INST	<i>RC Ernfied</i>	04 FEB 01	<i>RC Ernfied</i>	21 AUG 01
6. DAVID GIBSON	INSTRUCTOR	<i>D Gibson</i>	2/6/01	<i>D Gibson</i>	8/20/01
7. KEVIN MARTIN	INSTRUCTOR	<i>K Martin</i>	2-7-01	<i>K Martin</i>	8-13-01
8. WD KOECHER	Hardware Specialist	<i>WD Kocher</i>	2-15-01	<i>WD Kocher</i>	8-13-01
9. Wilfrid Schmitz	Senior Field Engineer	<i>W. J. Schmitz</i>	2-15-01	<i>W. J. Schmitz</i>	2-15-01
10. W.T. MARSHALL	SIM SOFTWARE SPRG.	<i>W. T. Marshall</i>	02/15/01	Signed per teleconf	8/17/01
11. C.M. Washington	Sim Software Spec.	<i>C. M. Washington</i>	2/15/01	<i>C. M. Washington</i>	8/13/01
12. Owen McElligott	Sim Software Spec.	<i>Owen McElligott</i>	2/15/01	<i>Owen McElligott</i>	8-13-01
13. DAVID KOZAK	NCO	<i>D Kozak</i>	2/19/01	<i>D Kozak</i>	8-20-01
14. R.T. GREEN	NSS	<i>R. T. Green</i>	2/19/01	<i>R. T. Green</i>	8-14-01
15. W.W. WATNER	NCO	<i>W. W. Watner</i>	2/19/01	<i>W. W. Watner</i>	8-20-01
16. L. A. HYNES	TENG. SYG. GUPV	<i>L. A. Hynes</i>	2/22/01	Signed per teleconf	8/17/01

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1 Date of Examination: 8/6/01 Operating Test Number: 1LOT4					
1. GENERAL CRITERIA			Initials		
			a	b*	c#
a.	The operating test conforms with the previously approved outline; changes are consistent with sampling requirements (e.g., 10 CFR 55.45, operational importance, safety function distribution).	TW	TEK	TF	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	TW	TEK	TF	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	TW	TEK	TF	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	TW	TEK	TF	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	TW	TEK	TF	
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA			--	--	--
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · initial conditions · initiating cues · references and tools, including associated procedures · reasonable and validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee · specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature - system response and other examiner cues - statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant - criteria for successful completion of the task - identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards - restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable 	TW	TEK	TF	
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	TW	TEK	TF	
c.	Repetition from operating tests used during the previous licensing examination is within acceptable limits (30% for the walk-through) and do not compromise test integrity.	TW	TEK	TF	
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	TW	TEK	TF	
3. SIMULATOR (CATEGORY C) CRITERIA			--	--	--
a.	The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.	TW	TEK	TF	
		Printed Name / Signature		Date	
a. Author	T. Wooley	<i>T. Wooley</i>		6-26-01	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	J. Kahner	<i>J. Kahner</i>		6/29/01	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	TODD FISH	<i>Todd Fish</i>		7/9/01	
d. NRC Supervisor	Richard J. Carter	<i>Richard J. Carter</i>		8/2/01	
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.					

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1 Date of Exam: 8/6/01 Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 / 3 Operating Test No.: 1LOT4							
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES					Initials		
					a	b*	c#
1.	The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	NU	DEM	TF			
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	NU	DEM	TF			
3.	Each event description consists of . the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated . the malfunction(s) that are entered to initiate the event . the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew . the expected operator actions (by shift position) . the event termination point (if applicable)	NU	DEM	TF			
4.	No more than one non-mechanistic failure (e.g., pipe break) is incorporated into the scenario without a credible preceding incident such as a seismic event.	NU	DEM	TF			
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	NU	DEM	TF			
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	NU	DEM	TF			
7.	If time compression techniques are used, the scenario summary clearly so indicates. Operators have sufficient time to carry out expected activities without undue time constraints. Cues are given.	NU	DEM	TF			
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	NU	DEM	TF			
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Any open simulator performance deficiencies have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.	NU	DEM	TF			
10.	Every operator will be evaluated using at least one new or significantly modified scenario. All other scenarios have been altered in accordance with Section D.4 of ES-301.	NU	DEM	TF			
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	NU	DEM	TF			
12.	Each applicant will be significantly involved in the minimum number of transients and events specified on Form ES-301-5 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios).	NU	DEM	TF			
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	NU	DEM	TF			
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)					Actual Attributes		
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	7	7	17	NU	DEM	TF
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2	5	13	NU	DEM	TF
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	2	2	12	NU	DEM	TF
4.	Major transients (1-2)	2	3	12	NU	DEM	TF
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	3	4	12	NU	DEM	TF
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1	1	11	NU	DEM	TF
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3	3	13	NU	DEM	TF

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1 Date of Exam: 8/6/01 Scenario Numbers: 4 / / Operating Test No.: 1LOT4

QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES		Initials			
		a	b*	c#	
		TW	TEH	TF	
1.	The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	TW	TEH	TF	
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	TW	TEH	TF	
3.	Each event description consists of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated · the malfunction(s) that are entered to initiate the event · the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew · the expected operator actions (by shift position) · the event termination point (if applicable) 	TW	TEH	TF	
4.	No more than one non-mechanistic failure (e.g., pipe break) is incorporated into the scenario without a credible preceding incident such as a seismic event.	TW	TEH	TF	
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	TW	TEH	TF	
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	TW	TEH	TF	
7.	If time compression techniques are used, the scenario summary clearly so indicates. Operators have sufficient time to carry out expected activities without undue time constraints. Cues are given.	TW	TEH	TF	
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	TW	TEH	TF	
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Any open simulator performance deficiencies have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.	TW	TEH	TF	
10.	Every operator will be evaluated using at least one new or significantly modified scenario. All other scenarios have been altered in accordance with Section D.4 of ES-301.	TW	TEH	TF	
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	TW	TEH	TF	
12.	Each applicant will be significantly involved in the minimum number of transients and events specified on Form ES-301-5 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios).	TW	TEH	TF	
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	TW	TEH	TF	
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		Actual Attributes			
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / /	TW	TEH	TF
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	6 / /	TW	TEH	TF
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	2 / /	TW	TEH	TF
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / /	TW	TEH	TF
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	3 / /	TW	TEH	TF
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1 / /	TW	TEH	TF
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	5 / /	TW	TEH	TF

OPERATING TEST NO.: 1LOT4 RO

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1	2	3	4 (Spare)
RO	Reactivity	1	1	1		3
	Normal	1	1	1		
	Instrument / Component	4	2, 4, 5, 6	2, 3, 6, 7		1, 3, 6*
	Major	1	8	7, 8		5

As RO	Reactivity					
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				

SRO-U	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (3) Whenever practical, both instrument and component malfunctions should be included; only those that require verifiable actions that provide insight to the applicant's competence count toward the minimum requirement.

Author: T. Wooley *T. Wooley*

NRC Reviewer: *Jedd Zilio*

* - Event #6 includes multiple component failures as described in the scenario outline.

OPERATING TEST NO.: 1LOT4 SRO-I

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1	2	3	4 (Spare)
RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	4				
	Major	1				

As RO	Reactivity	1			4	
	Normal	0			1	
	Instrument / Component	2			2, 4, 7	
	Major	1			5, 6	
SRO-I						
As SRO	Reactivity	0	1	1		3
	Normal	1	1	1		
	Instrument / Component	2	2 - 5	2, 4, 6		1 - 4, 6
	Major	1	8	7		6

SRO-U	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (4) Whenever practical, both instrument and component malfunctions should be included; only those that require verifiable actions that provide insight to the applicant's competence count toward the minimum requirement.

Author:

T. Wooley *T. Wooley*

NRC Reviewer:

Judd R. [Signature]

Competencies	RO - 1/3/5				RO - 2/4				SRO-I			
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	1 RO	2 PO	3	4 RO	1 PO	2 RO	3	4 PO	1 SRO	2	3 RO	4 SRO
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	2, 4 5, 6 8	4, 5 6-8		1, 3 4, 5 6	3, 7 8	2, 3 6-8		2, 5 6	2-5 8		2, 3 7	1-5
Diagnose Events and Conditions	2, 4 6, 8	4, 5 6-8		1, 3 5	3, 7 8	2, 3 6-8		2, 5 6	4, 5 6, 8		2 4-7	1-5
Understand Plant and System Response	2, 4 6, 8	4, 5 6, 8		1, 3 5, 6	3, 7 8	2, 3 6, 8		2, 5 6	2, 3 4 6-8		2, 5 6, 7	1-3 5, 6
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1, 2 4, 5 6, 8	1 4-8		1, 3 5, 6	1, 3 7, 8	1, 2 3 6-8		2, 3 5, 6	1-6 8		2, 4 6, 7	All
Operate Control Boards (2)	1, 2 4, 6 8	1 4-8		1, 3 5, 6	1, 3 7, 8	1, 3 6-8		2, 3 5, 6	N/A		1, 2 4 6, 7	N/A
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	All	All		All	All	All		All	All		All	All
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	All		N/A	All
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	2, 3 4		N/A	1, 2 3

Notes:

- (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.
- (2) Optional for an SRO-U.
- (3) Only applicable to SROs.

Instructions:

Circle the applicant's license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant.

Author:

T. Wooley

T. Wooley

NRC Reviewer:

Sodd

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1		Date of Exam: 8/10/01		Exam Level: RO			
Item Description				Initial			
				a	b*	c#	
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility			TW	TEK	TF	
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available			TW	TEK	TF	
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401			TW	TEK	TF	
	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process					TF	
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)			TW	TEK	TF	
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	Bank	Modified	New	TW	TEK	TF
		8	3	89			
7.	Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right	Memory		C/A	TW	TEK	TF
		47		53			
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers			TW	TEK	TF	
9.	Question content conforms with specific K/A statements in the previously approved examination outline and is appropriate for the Tier to which they are assigned; deviations are justified			TW	TEK	TF	
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines			TW	TEK	TF	
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet			TW	TEK	TF	
				Printed Name / Signature		Date	
a. Author	T. Wooley / <i>T. Wooley</i>					6-26-01	
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	T. Kuhner / <i>T. Kuhner</i>					6/29/01	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Tom FISH / <i>Tom FISH</i>					7/16/01	
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	R.W. Cantel / <i>R.W. Cantel</i>					8/2/01	
<p>Note: * The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.</p>							

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1		Date of Exam: 8/10/01		Exam Level: SRO			
Item Description				Initial			
				a	b*	c#	
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility			TW	TEX	TF	
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available			TW	TEX	TF	
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401			TW	TEX	TF	
	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process					TF	
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)			TW	TEX	TF	
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	Bank	Modified	New	TW	TEX	TF
		5	1	94			
7.	Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right	Memory		C/A	TW	TEX	TF
		40		60			
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers			TW	TEX	TF	
9.	Question content conforms with specific K/A statements in the previously approved examination outline and is appropriate for the Tier to which they are assigned; deviations are justified			TW	TEX	TF	
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines			TW	TEX	TF	
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet			TW	TEX	TF	
				Printed Name / Signature		Date	
a. Author	T. Wooley / <i>T. Wooley</i>					6-26-01	
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	T. Kuhner / <i>T. Kuhner</i>					6/29/01	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Todd Fish / <i>Todd Fish</i>					7/10/01	
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	R.J. Carter / <i>R.J. Carter</i>					8/12/01	
<p>Note: * The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.</p>							

Facility: FENOC BVPS Unit 1		Date of Exam: 8/10/01		Exam Level: RO & SRO	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	TW	CHT	TF		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	TW	CHT	TF		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	TW	CHT	TF		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail	TW	CHT	TF		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	TW	CHT	TF		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	TW	CHT	TF		
		Printed Name / Signature	Date		
a. Grader	<u>T. WOOLEY / T. Wooly</u>		<u>8/17/01</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>C.P. HYNES / C.P. Hynes</u>		<u>8/22/01</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>TODD FISH / Todd H. Fish</u>		<u>8/24/01</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>R.J. Conite / R.J. Conite</u>		<u>9/13/01</u>		
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					